

<u>Sub-Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Average Jeopardy Notice Intervals & Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices</u>	<u>POTS - Residence</u> <u>POTS - Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Percent Missed Installation Appointments</u>	<u><10 lines/circuits</u> <u>>10 lines/circuits</u> <u>Dispatch/ No Dispatch</u> <u>POTS - Residence</u> <u>POTS - Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Average Completion Interval/Order Completion Interval Distribution</u>	<u>Dispatch/ No Dispatch</u> <u>Residence and Business reported in day intervals: 0,1,2,3,4,5,5+</u> <u>UNE and Design reported in day intervals: 0-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-30, >=30</u> <u><10 lines/circuits</u> <u>>=10 lines/circuits</u> <u>POTS - Residence</u> <u>POTS - Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	

<u>Sub-Process</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
<u>Average Completion Notice Interval</u>	<u>Reporting interval in hours: 0-1, 1-2, 2-4, 4-8, 8-12, 12-24, >24, plus overall average hour interval</u> <u><10 lines/circuits</u> <u>>=10 lines/circuits</u> <u>POTS - Residence</u> <u>POTS - Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Coordinated Customer Conversion</u>	<u>Reported in intervals: <=5 min., >5 and <=15 min., >15 min., plus Overall Average Interval</u> <u>UNE Loops without INP</u> <u>UNE Loops with INP</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Percent Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Activity</u>	<u><10 lines/circuits</u> <u>>10 lines/circuits</u> <u>Dispatch/ No Dispatch</u> <u>POTS - Residence</u> <u>POTS - Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
<u>Total Service Order Cycle Time</u>	<u>Dispatch/ No Dispatch</u> <u>POTS – Residence</u> <u>POTS – Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Service Order Accuracy</u>	<10 lines/circuits >10 lines/circuits <u>Dispatch/ No Dispatch</u> <u>POTS – Residence</u> <u>POTS – Business</u> <u>Design</u> <u>UNE Design</u> <u>UNE Non-Design</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation and comparison purposes and are complete.</u>	
<u>Percent Rejected Service Requests</u>	<u>Mechanized</u>	<u>Availability of Interface</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>O&P 7 1 1</u>
<u>Reject Interval</u>	<u>Mechanized</u>	<u>Availability of Interface</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>O&P 7 2 1</u>
<u>Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness</u>	<u>Mechanized</u>	<u>Availability of Interface</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>O&P 7 3 1</u>
<u>Percentage of Subsequent Reports</u>	<u>UNE Designed</u>	<u>Availability of Interface</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>O&P 7 4 1</u>
	<u>UNE Non-Designed</u>	<u>Availability of Interface</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>O&P 7 4 2</u>
<u>Average Completion Interval</u>	<u>UNE Dispatch</u>	<u>Availability of Interface</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>O&P 7 5 1</u>

Sub-Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-5-2
Order Completion Interval Distribution	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-6-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-6-2
Held Order Interval Distribution and Mean Interval	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-7-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-7-2
Average Jeopardy Notice Interval	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-8-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-8-2
Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-9-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-9-2
Percent Provisioning Troubles within 30 Days	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-10-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-10-2
Percent Service Order Accuracy	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-11-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-11-2
Average Completion Notice Interval	UNE Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-12-1
	UNE Non-Dispatch	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 7-12-2

8.0 O&P-8: EDI Documentation Evaluation

The EDI Documentation Evaluation is an analysis of the BellSouth provided documentation used by CLECs to interface and interact with the EDI interface for ordering and provisioning activities. This evaluation is intended to review the availability, accuracy and completeness of BellSouth's ordering and provisioning documentation using a variety of operational analysis techniques. This test will receive as input from the O&P-1: EDI Functional Test an exceptions report due to documentation which addresses whether system functionality matches that described in the business rules documentation.

The following evaluation criteria (will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test O&P-8.

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Cases Reference</u>
O&P-8 Documentation	LEO Implementation Guides (Volumes 1-4) <u>Document Structure and Format</u>	<u>Existence of Structural Elements</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u> <u>Document Content</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Change Management</u> <u>Notification Process</u>	O&P-8-1 1 O&P-8-1.6-8-1.14
	<u>Document Content</u> PC-EDI Training Document	<u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Change Management</u> <u>Notification Process</u>	O&P-8-1 2 O&P-8-1.15-8-23
	<u>Release Management</u> Carrier Notifications off the BellSouth website	<u>Existence and Adequacy of Update Process</u> <u>Availability of Documentation</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Change Management</u> <u>Notification Process</u>	O&P-8-1 3 O&P-8-1.23

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
	<u>Document Accuracy</u>	<u>Accuracy of Documents</u>	
	<u>Resale CLEC Activation Requirements</u>	Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 8 1 4
<u>Submit an Order</u>	<u>Create and send order in LSR format</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive FOC/error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Submit and Error</u>	<u>Create and send order in LSR format</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive planned error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Correct errors</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive FOC</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Supplement an Order</u>	<u>Create and send supplement transactions</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive FOC/error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Correct errors</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Pre-Order/Order Integration</u>	<u>Populate integration orders with information returned from designated pre-order response</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Submit integration orders</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive acknowledgement</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Correct errors</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Receive Completion Notice (CN)</u>	<u>Receive CN transaction</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Receive Jeopardy Notification</u>	<u>Receive jeopardy notification transaction</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Check Service Order Status</u>	<u>Check service order status</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
	Local Number Portability Ordering Guide	Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 8-1-5

9.0 O&P-9: TAG Documentation Evaluation

The TAG Documentation Evaluation is an analysis of the BellSouth provided documentation used by CLECs to interface and interact with the TAG interface for ordering and provisioning activities. This evaluation is intended to review the availability, accuracy and completeness of BellSouth's ordering and provisioning documentation using a variety of operational analysis techniques. This test will receive as input from the O&P-2: TAG Functional Test an exceptions report due to documentation which addresses whether system functionality matches that described in the business rules documentation. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test O&P-9.

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Cross Reference</u>
O&P-9 Documentation	Document Structure and Format LEO Implementation Guides (Volumes 1-4)	Existence of Structural Elements Completeness of Data Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 9-1 10&P 9-1.6 9-1.14
	Document Content TAG Technical and Programmer Reference Guide(s)	Clarity of Information Completeness of Data Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 9-1 20&P-9-1.15-9-1.23
	Release Management Carrier Notifications off the BellSouth website	Existence and Adequacy of the Update Process Availability of Documentation Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 9-1-3
	Document Accuracy	Accuracy of Documents	

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
	Resale CLEC Activation Requirements	Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 9-1-4
<u>Submit an Order</u>	<u>Create and send order in LSR format</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive FOC/error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Submit and Error</u>	<u>Create and send order in LSR format</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive planned error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Correct errors</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive FOC</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Supplement an Order</u>	<u>Create and send supplement transactions</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive FOC/error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Correct errors</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Pre-Order/Order Integration)</u>	<u>Populate integration orders with information returned from designated pre-order response</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Submit integration orders</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive acknowledgement</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Receive error/reject notification</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
	<u>Correct errors</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Receive Completion Notice (CN)</u>	<u>Receive CN transaction</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Receive Jeopardy Notification</u>	<u>Receive jeopardy notification transaction</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	
<u>Check Service Order Status</u>	<u>Check service order status</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Content of Document(s)</u>	

<i>Sub-Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Cross Reference</i>
	Local Number Portability Ordering Guide	Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) Clarity of Information Change Management Notification Process	O&P 915

10.0 O&P-10: EDI/TAG Production Volume Performance Test

The EDI/TAG Peak Volume Performance Test will evaluate the behavior and performance of both the EDI and TAG interfaces under current capacities of the production system. This test cycle will execute selected flow-through pre-ordering (TAG only) and resale and UNE service request test cases, excluding error conditions.

The test will be executed during an 8-hour period. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test O&P-10.

<i>Sub-Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Case Reference</i>
Submit Orders in Production Volumes	Create order transaction(s)	Availability of Interface Timeliness of Response	O&P 10-1-1
	Send order in LSR format	Availability of Interface	O&P 10-1-2
	Receive acknowledgment	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 10-1-3
	Receive FOC or error/rejection notification	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	O&P 10-1-4

VI. Billing Test Section

1.0 BLG-1: CRIS/CABS Invoicing Functional Test

The CRIS/CABS Invoicing Functional Test will evaluate the functional elements of the carrier invoicing process for UNEs as delivered to CLECs by the CRIS/CABS interface. This test cycle will be executed by placing test calls on those UNE scenarios selected for provisioning as part of the EDI/TAG functional tests (O&P-1 and O&P-2). KPMG will place calls on provisioned lines to generate usage and invoice detail. The functional elements of UNE invoicing that will be specifically targeted by this test include usage and measured rate billing, recurring and non-recurring charges, pro-ration of charges, the recording of account configuration changes, adjustments, and the accuracy of invoice line item details delivered by both the CABS/CRIS systems. KPMG will use process walk-throughs/interviews to ensure quality of internal processes. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test BLG-1.

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cases Reference
Adjustment	Enter adjustments	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-1-1
	Track adjustments	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-1-2
Maintain Bill Balance	Carry balance forward	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-2-1
Review Bills	Verify normal recurring charges	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-3-1
	Verify one-time charges	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-3-2
	Verify prorated recurring charges	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-3-3
	Verify usage charges	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-3-4
	Verify adjustments (debits and credits)	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Response	BLG-1-3-5
	Verify late charges	Presence of Functionality Clarity of Information Accuracy of Response Document(s)	BLG-1-3-6
Balance Cycle	Define balancing and reconciliation procedures	Process Validation Presence of Functionality Clarity of Information Accuracy of Document(s)	BLG-1-4-1
	Produce control reports	Presence of Functionality Clarity of Information Accuracy of Document(s)	BLG-1-4-2
	Release cycle	Presence of Functionality Clarity of Information Accuracy of Document(s)	BLG-1-4-3

Sub-Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
Deliver Bill	Deliver bill media	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	BLC-1-5-1
Maintain Bill history	Maintain billing information	Process Validation Presence of Functionality Clarity of Information Accuracy of Document(s)	BLC-1-6-1
	Access billing information	Presence of Functionality Clarity of Information Accuracy of Document(s)	BLC-1-6-2
Request re-send	Deliver bill media	Process Validation Presence of Functionality Accuracy of Document(s) Timeliness of Response	BLC-1-7-1

2.0 BLG-2: ODUF/ADUF Usage Functional Test

The Daily Usage File Test will evaluate the functional elements of daily message/usage processing for UNE ports as delivered to CLECs by the ADUF/ODUF interfaces. This test cycle will be executed by KPMG placing test calls on those UNE port and port loop scenarios selected for provisioning as part of the EDI/TAG functional tests (O&P-1 and O&P-2). The functional elements of daily message/usage processing for UNE ports that will be specifically targeted by this test include the completeness and accuracy of the call details across a variety of incoming and outgoing call types, changes in account disposition/configuration, and CO switch types. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test BLG-2.

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
Receipt of usage by BellSouth	Receive switch records at data center	Process Validation Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-1-1
	Verify DUF data	Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-1-2
Daily Usage Feed	Create usage feed	Process Validation Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-2-1
	Define balancing and reconciliation procedures	Clarity of Information Accuracy of Document(s) Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-2-2
	Route usage	Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-2-3
Deliver usage to CLECs	Send Connect:Direct®	Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-3-1
	Acknowledge arrival	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	BLC-2-3-2
Maintain usage history	Create usage backup	Process Validation Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-4-1
	Request backup data	Presence of Functionality	BLC-2-4-2
Status tracking and reporting	Track valid usage	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of response	BLC-2-5-1
	Account for no usage	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of response	BLC-2-5-2
	Account for missing usage (gaps)	Presence of Functionality Accuracy of response	BLC-2-5-3

3.0 BLG-3: Billing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation

The Billing Systems Capacity Management Evaluation is a detailed review of the safeguards and procedures in place to plan for and manage projected growth in the use of the billing applications. The following evaluation criteria (will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test BLG-3.

<i>Sub Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Case Reference</i>
Billing Systems Capacity Management	Data collection and reporting of business volumes, resource utilization, and performance monitoring	Adequacy and Completeness of data collection and reporting	BLG 3-1-1
	Data verification and analysis of business volumes, resource utilization, and performance monitoring	Adequacy and Completeness of data verification and analysis	BLG 3-1-2
	Systems and capacity planning.	Adequacy and Completeness systems and capacity planning	BLG 3-1-3

4.0 BLG-4: Billing Performance Results Comparison Measures Evaluation

The Billing Performance Results Comparison Measures Evaluation is a comparative analysis of billing performance results collected by the test through test management tools and those collected by BellSouth's performance measurement system from BellSouth's OSS. The source results collected from BLG-1: CRIS/CABS Invoicing Functional Test and BLG-2: ODUF/ADUF Usage Functional Test will be compared to performance measures metrics, accuracy and trends will be identified, and disparities will be analyzed for significance. Overall, for consistency testing, four test results sources will be used and compared to ensure BellSouth accuracy:

- Daily usage files ODUF/ADUF
- CRIS/CABS test invoices
- BellSouth's performance measurements system data collected
- Test Call Log

The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test BLG-4.

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cross Reference
<u>Invoice Accuracy</u>	<u>Resale</u> <u>UNE</u> <u>Interconnection</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
<u>Mean Time to Deliver Invoices</u>	<u>Resale</u> <u>UNE</u> <u>Interconnection</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Usage Data Delivery Accuracy</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
<u>12/15/19993/28/2000</u>			
Appendix D1 - Evaluation Criteria		Georgia OSS Evaluation Master Test Plan Version 4.04.1	
Page D1- 48			

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
<u>Usage Data Delivery Completeness</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Usage Data Delivery Timeliness</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Mean Time to Deliver Usage</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Invoicing accuracy</u>	<u>Non-Designed UNE (billed through CRIS)</u>	<u>Clarity of Information</u>	<u>BLC 4-1-1</u>
	<u>Designed UNE (billed through CABS)</u>	<u>Clarity of Information</u>	<u>BLC 4-1-2</u>
	<u>Port Usage (billed through CABS)</u>	<u>Clarity of Information</u>	<u>BLC 4-1-3</u>
<u>Invoice timeliness</u>	<u>Non-Designed UNE (billed through CRIS)</u>	<u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>BLC 4-2-1</u>
	<u>Designed UNE (billed through CABS)</u>	<u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>BLC 4-2-2</u>
	<u>Port Usage (billed through CABS)</u>	<u>Timeliness of Response</u>	<u>BLC 4-2-3</u>

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
Usage data delivery timeliness	Port Usage	Timeliness of Response	BLC 4.3.1
Usage data delivery completeness	Port Usage		BLC 4.4.1

Usage data delivery accuracy	Port Usage	Accuracy of Response Clarity of Information	BLC 4.5
------------------------------	------------	--	---------

5.0 BLG-5: CRIS/CABS Invoicing Documentation Evaluation

The CRIS/CABS Invoicing Documentation Evaluation is an analysis of the documentation used by CLECs to interact with BellSouth's invoicing systems when conducting billing activities. This high level evaluation is intended to review the accuracy and completeness of BellSouth's documentation using a variety of operational analysis techniques. Since there is no direct system interaction with CRIS/CABS, this documentation evaluation will be concerned with analyzing the accuracy of documentation with respect to connectivity to gather invoices, delivery of invoices and the overall format and contents of the invoices delivered. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test BLG-5.

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
Billing Invoicing Documentation	<u>Document Structure and Format</u> <u>Document Change Management</u>	<u>Existence of Structural Elements</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u>	BLG-5-1-1
	<u>Document Content Management</u> <u>Document Content</u>	<u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u>	BLG-5-1-2
	<u>Documentation Distribution</u> <u>Release Management</u>	<u>Existence and Adequacy of the Update Process</u> <u>Availability of Documentation(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	BLG-5-1-3
	<u>Document Content</u> <u>Document Accuracy</u>	<u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Documents</u>	BLG-5-1-4

6.0 BLG-6: ODUF/ADUF Documentation Evaluation

The ODUF/ADUF Documentation Evaluation is an analysis of the documentation used by CLECs to interact with BellSouth's usage reporting systems when conducting billing activities. This high level evaluation is intended to review the accuracy and completeness of BellSouth's documentation using a variety of operational analysis techniques. Since there is no direct system interaction with BellSouth's systems in this process, this documentation evaluation will be concerned with analyzing the accuracy of documentation with respect to connectivity to gather usage records, delivery of usage records and the overall format and contents of the daily usage files delivered. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test BLG-6.

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
Billing Usage Reporting Documentation	<u>Document Change Management</u> <u>Document Structure and Format</u>	Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) <u>Existence of Structural Elements</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u>	BLG-6-1-1
	<u>Document Content Management</u> <u>Document Content</u>	Availability of Document(s) Accuracy of Document(s) Structure of Document(s) Distribution of Document(s) <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u>	BLG-6-1-2
	<u>Documentation Distribution</u> <u>Release Management</u>	Availability of Document(s) <u>Existence and Adequacy of the Update Process</u> <u>Availability of Documentation</u> <u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	BLG-6-1-3
	<u>Document Content</u> <u>Document Accuracy</u>	Accuracy of Document(s) <u>Accuracy of Documents</u>	BLG-6-1-4

VII. Maintenance and Repair Test Section

1.0 M&R-1: TAFI Functional Test

The TAFI Functional Test will evaluate the functional elements of the trouble reporting and screening process for telephone number assigned UNEs as delivered to CLECs via the TAFI interface in BellSouth's production environment. This test cycle will be executed by submitting trouble reports against provisioned test bed accounts

TAFI functionality will be reviewed along with the documentation addressing its use. The functional elements trouble reporting and screening that will be specifically targeted by this test include the entry and resolution of trouble reports, query and receipt of status reports, access to test capabilities, access to trouble history, and error conditions. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-1.

<u>Sub-Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Cross Reference</u>
Trouble reports	Create trouble report	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1-1-1
	Modify trouble report	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1-1-2
	Create repeat report	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1-1-3
	Create subsequent report	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1-1-4
	Retrieve LMOS recent status report	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	M&R 1-1-5
	<u>Enter Multiple Trouble Reports</u>	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	
	<u>Execute manual queuing capabilities</u> <u>Enter and Retrieve Trouble Reports from Queues</u>	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u>	M&R 1-1-6
	Execute supervisor functions	Presence of Functionality <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u>	M&R 1-1-7

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
	<u>Close trouble report</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	
	<u>Cancel trouble report</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u>	
Access to test capability	Initiate port and loop-port test	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 2 1
	View port and loop-port test results	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 2 2
<u>Downstream System Reports</u>	<u>Retrieve LMOS recent status report</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	
	Obtain customer line record <u>(BOCRIS)</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 2 3
	Obtain predictor results	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 2 4
	View DLR (Display Line Record)	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 2 5
	View SOCS pending order (open issue)	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 2 6
	<u>Close trouble report</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u>	M&R 1 2 7
	<u>Cancel trouble report</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u>	M&R 1 2 8
Access error reports	<u>Reset communications</u>	<u>Presence of Functionality</u>	M&R 1 3 1

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
	Host request errors	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 3 2
Trouble history	Retrieve trouble history	<u>Presence of Functionality</u> <u>Accuracy of Response</u> <u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Timeliness of Response</u> <u>TAFI Usability</u>	M&R 1 4 1
Trouble status <u>General</u>	View pending ticket status <u>TAFI Usability</u>	Accuracy of Response Clarity of Information Timeliness of Response TAFI Usability	M&R 1 5 1

2.0 M&R-2: ECTA Functional Test

The ECTA Functional Test will evaluate the functional elements of the trouble reporting and screening process for both telephone number assigned and circuit identified UNEs as delivered to CLECs via the ECTA interface. This test cycle will be executed by exercising a defined set of ECTA functions associated with trouble management activities against test bed accounts.

ECTA functionality will be reviewed along with the documentation addressing its use. The functional elements of trouble reporting and screening that will be specifically targeted by this test include the entry and resolution of trouble reports, the query and receipt of status reports, and error conditions. The ECTA Functional Test will be conducted against BellSouth's production environment system. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-2.

<i>Sub-Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Case Reference</i>
Trouble reports	Create trouble report	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	M&R 2-1-1 M&R 2-2-1
	Modify trouble report	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	M&R 2-1-4 M&R 2-2-4
	Cancel trouble report	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	M&R 2-1-5 M&R 2-2-5
	Request trouble ticket status	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	M&R 2-1-2 M&R 2-2-2
	Verify repair completion	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	M&R 2-1-6 M&R 2-2-6
	Add trouble information	Presence of Functionality Timeliness of Response	M&R 2-1-3 M&R 2-2-3

3.0 M&R-3: ECTA Normal Volume Performance Test

The ECTA Normal Volume Performance Test will evaluate the behavior and performance of the ECTA interface under "normal" YE01 projected transaction load conditions. This test cycle will be executed by a test transaction generator capable of submitting large volumes of resale services and UNE trouble test cases in a manner consistent with ECTA's current and forecasted daily usage patterns and transaction mix, including error conditions. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-3.

<i>Sub Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Case Reference</i>
Submit trouble transactions in projected normal volumes	Create trouble report	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 3-1-1 M&R 3-2-1
	Modify trouble report	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 3-1-4 M&R 3-2-4
	Cancel trouble ticket	Correctness of Response Timeliness of response	M&R 3-1-5 M&R 3-2-5
	Request trouble ticket status	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 3-1-2 M&R 3-2-4
	Verify Repair Completion	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 3-1-6 M&R 3-2-6
	Add trouble information	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 3-1-3 M&R 3-2-3

4.0 M&R-4: ECTA Peak Volume Performance Test

The ECTA Peak Volume Performance Test will evaluate the behavior and performance of the ECTA interface under peak YE01 projected transaction load conditions. This test cycle will be run following the execution of the ECTA Normal Volume Performance Test (M&R-3) and will utilize a selected sample of resale services and UNE trouble test cases, including error conditions.

The peak volume forecast will be developed using the peak hourly load identified for the ECTA Normal Volume Performance Test and replicating those transaction volumes across an 8-hour period. Alternatively, if BellSouth's normal daily usage patterns are relatively flat, a multiple may be applied to the peak hourly load and the result replicated across an 8-hour day. The methodology and calculations are discussed further in Appendix C: Volume Analysis. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-4.

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cross Reference
Submit trouble transactions in projected normal volumes	Create trouble report	Correctness of response Timeliness of Response	M&R 4-1-1 M&R 4-2-1
	Modify trouble report	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 4-1-4 M&R 4-2-4
	Cancel trouble ticket	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 4-1-5 M&R 4-2-5
	Request trouble ticket status	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 4-1-2 M&R 4-2-2
	Verify Repair Completion	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 4-1-6 M&R 4-2-6
	Add Trouble Administration Information	Correctness of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 4-1-3 M&R 4-2-3

5.0 M&R-5: TAFI Capacity Management Evaluation

The TAFI Capacity Management Evaluation is a detailed review of the safeguards and procedures in place to plan for and manage projected growth in the use of TAFI interfaces. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-5.

<i>Sub-Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Cases Reference</i>
TAFI Capacity Management	Data collection and reporting of business volumes, resource utilization, and performance monitoring	Adequacy and Completeness of data collection and reporting	M&R 5-1-1
	Data verification and analysis of business volumes, resource utilization, and performance monitoring.	Adequacy and Completeness of data verification and analysis	M&R 5-1-2
	Systems and capacity planning.	Adequacy and Completeness of systems and capacity planning	M&R 5-1-3

6.0 M&R-6: ECTA Capacity Management Evaluation

The ECTA Capacity Management Evaluation is a detailed review of the safeguards and procedures in place to plan for and manage projected growth in the use of ECTA interfaces. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-6.

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
ECTA Capacity Management	Data collection and reporting of business volumes, resource utilization, and performance monitoring	Adequacy and Completeness of data collection and reporting	M&R-6-1-1
	Data verification and analysis of business volumes, resource utilization, and performance monitoring.	Adequacy and Completeness of data verification and analysis	M&R-6-1-2
	Systems and capacity planning.	Adequacy and Completeness of systems and capacity planning	M&R-6-1-3

7.0 M&R-7: M&R Performance Results Comparison Measures Evaluation

The M&R Performance Results Comparison Measures Evaluation is a comparative analysis of M&R performance results collected by KPMG test management tools and BellSouth's OSS performance measurements systems. The source results collected from M&R-1: TAFI Functional Test, M&R-2: ECTA Functional Test, M&R-3: ECTA Normal Volume Performance Test, and M&R-4: ECTA Peak Volume Performance Test will be compared to BellSouth's performance measurements systems, accuracy and trends will be identified, and disparities will be analyzed for significance. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-7.

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cases Reference
<u>Missed Repair Appointments</u>	<u>POTS – Residence, Business Design</u> <u>PBX, CENTREX, AND ISDN</u> <u>UNE 2 Wire Loop (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Loop Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>Dispatch/No Dispatch</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Customer Trouble Report Rate</u>	<u>POTS – Residence, Business Design</u> <u>PBX, CENTREX, AND ISDN</u> <u>UNE 2 Wire Loop (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Loop Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>Dispatch/No Dispatch</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Maintenance Average Duration</u>	<u>POTS – Residence, Business Design</u> <u>PBX, CENTREX, AND ISDN</u> <u>UNE 2 Wire Loop (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Loop Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>Dispatch/No Dispatch</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Case Reference</u>
<u>Percent Report Troubles within 30 days</u>	<u>POTS – Residence, Business Design</u> <u>PBX, CENTREX, AND ISDN</u> <u>UNE 2 Wire Loop (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Loop Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>Dispatch/No Dispatch</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>Out of Service >24 hours</u>	<u>POTS – Residence, Business Design</u> <u>PBX, CENTREX, AND ISDN</u> <u>UNE 2 Wire Loop (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Loop Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>UNE Other (Design and Non-Design)</u> <u>Dispatch/No Dispatch</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
		<u>Test data collected by KPMG agrees with BLS raw data.</u>	
<u>OSS Interface Availability</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
<u>OSS Response Interval and Percentages</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	
<u>Average Answer Time – Repair Centers</u>	<u>Not Disaggregated</u>	<u>BLS reports are correctly disaggregated and complete.</u>	
		<u>KPMG-calculated SOM values agree with BLS-reported SOM values.</u>	
		<u>BLS raw data are suitable for calculation purposes and are complete.</u>	

Sub Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Case Reference
Missed repair appointment	UNE Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 1 1
	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 1 2
Percentage of subsequent reports	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 2 1
Maintenance average duration	UNE Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 3 1
	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 3 2
Out-of-service-> 24 hours	UNE Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 4 1
	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 4 2
Repeat troubles within 30 days	UNE Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 5 1
	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 5 2
OSS response interval	UNE Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 6 1
	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 6 2
Average answer time	UNE Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 7 1
	UNE Non-Designed	Availability of Interface Accuracy of Response Timeliness of Response	M&R 7 7 2

8.0 M&R-8: TAFI Documentation Evaluation

The TAFI Documentation Evaluation is an analysis of the BellSouth-provided documentation used by CLECs to interface and interact with the TAFI interface for maintenance and repair activities. This evaluation is intended to review the availability, accuracy and completeness of BellSouth's maintenance and repair documentation using a variety of operational analysis techniques. This test uses records of observations from the M&R-1: TAFI Functional Test and CLEC TAFI User Training Manuals to identify incidents in documentation and functionality described in the business rules. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-8.

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Cross Reference</u>
M&R Documentation	<u>Document Structure and Format</u> CLEC TAFI End User Training and User Guide	<u>Existence of Structural Elements</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u>	M&R-8-1-1
	<u>Document Content</u> CLEC Training Guide (M&R Sections)	<u>Clarity of Information</u> <u>Completeness of Data</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u>	M&R-8-1-2
	<u>Release Management</u> TAFI Online Help	<u>Existence and Adequacy of the Update Process</u> <u>Availability of Documentation</u> <u>Accuracy of Documentation</u> <u>Availability of Document(s)</u> <u>Accuracy of Document(s)</u> <u>Structure of Document(s)</u> <u>Distribution of Document(s)</u>	M&R-8-1-3

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Cross Reference</u>
--------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

<u>Sub Process</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Test Cross Reference</u>
<u>TAFI Interface</u>	<u>Trouble Report</u>	<u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	
	<u>Access to Test Capability</u>	<u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	
	<u>Access to Downstream System Reports</u>	<u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	
	<u>Error Reports</u>	<u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	
	<u>Trouble History</u>	<u>Accuracy of Documentation</u>	

9.0 M&R-9: ECTA Documentation Evaluation

The ECTA Documentation Evaluation is an analysis of the BellSouth-provided documentation used by CLECs to interface and interact with the ECTA interface for maintenance and repair activities. This evaluation is intended to review the accuracy, ease of use and conformance to ANSI standards of BellSouth's maintenance and repair documentation using a variety of operational analysis techniques. This test will use records of observations from the M&R-2: ECTA Functional Test to identify incidents in documentation and functionality. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-9.

Sub-Process	Function	Evaluation Criteria	Test Cases Reference
M&R Documentation	Joint Implementation Agreement for Electronic Communications Trouble Administration (ECTA) Gateway for Local Service (JIA)	Accuracy of Document Ease of Use of Document Conformance of Document to ANSI Standards	M&R 9-1-1 M&R 9-1-2 M&R 9-1-3

10.0 M&R-10: M&R Process Evaluation

The M&R Process Evaluation Test is comprised of two major elements. The first (Sub-Test 1) evaluates the functional equivalence of BellSouth's M&R processes for wholesale and retail trouble reports. Process flows for wholesale and retail trouble management will be reviewed and evaluated along with technician methods and procedures (M&P) and job aids for wholesale trouble repair.

The second element (Sub-Test 2) involves the execution and observation of selected M&R test scenarios to evaluate BellSouth's performance in making repairs under the conditions of various wholesale maintenance scenarios.

The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test M&R-10.

<i>Sub-Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Cases / References</i>
End-to-End M&R Process	Process flow documentation	<u>Completeness</u> Wholesale/Retail Comparison	M&R-10-1-1
	Process evaluation	Wholesale/Retail Comparison	M&R-10-1-2
End-to-End Trouble Report Processing	M&R test situations	<u>Accuracy</u> <u>Timeliness</u> <u>Wholesale/Retail Comparison</u>	M&R-10-2

VIII. Change Management Test Section

1.0 CM-1: Change Management Practices Review

This test evaluates the overall policies and practices for managing change in the procedures and systems necessary for establishing and maintaining effective relationships between BellSouth and CLECs. The results of this test will rely upon checklists and inspections. The following evaluation criteria will be used to address the sub-processes and functions evaluated in test CM-1.

<i>Sub Process</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Test Cross Reference</i>
Change Management	Developing Change Proposals	Completeness and consistency of change development process	CM 1.1 CM 1.2
	Evaluating Change Proposals	Completeness and consistency of change evaluation process	CM 1.3 CM 1.4 CM 1.7
	Implementing Change	Completeness and consistency of change implementation process	CM 1.7
	Intervals	Reasonableness of change interval	CM 1.5
	Documentation	Timeliness of documentation updates	CM 1.6
	Tracking Change Proposals	Adequacy and completeness of change management tracking process	CM 1.7 CM 1.8